United Nations ECE/CES/2015/14/Add.10

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
15 June 2015

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-third plenary session
Geneva, 15-17 June 2015
Item 7 (a) of the provisional agenda
Reports on the work of the Conference of European Statisticians, its Bureau and Teams of Specialists

Implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2014

Note by the Secretariat

Addendum

Report of the Seminar on Poverty Measurement

Summary

The UNECE Seminar on Poverty Measurement was held on 5-6 May 2015 at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland as part of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Statistical Programme 2014-2015.

The present document is the summary report of that meeting and is provided to inform the Conference of European Statisticians of the organization and outcomes of the meeting.

GE.15-09723 (E)
1509723

Please recycle

I. Attendance

1. The UNECE Seminar on Poverty Measurement was held on 5-6 May 2015 at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland. It was attended by participants from Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Canada, Chile, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Mongolia, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, and Uzbekistan. The European Commission was represented by Eurostat and the European Union's Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS-Stat), the Eurasian Economic Commission, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), the United Nations Statistics Division, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank were also represented. Experts from Oxford University (United Kingdom), University of Heidelberg (Germany), the Central Union of Turkish Agricultural Credit Cooperatives, and TU Dortmund University (Germany) participated at the invitation of the UNECE secretariat.

2. A number of participants could attend the Seminar thanks to the financial support provided by the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

II. Organization of the meeting

3. Mr. Andrew Heisz of Statistics Canada was elected as Chair of the meeting.

4. The following topics were discussed at the meeting:

(a) Sustainable Development Goals and poverty measurement

(b) Practices in the UNECE region

(c) Monetary poverty: country cases

(d) Monetary poverty: comparability

(e) Multidimensional poverty: country cases

(f) Multidimensional poverty index

(g) Discussion on future work

(h) Subjective poverty

(i) Population groups

5. The following participants acted as discussants: for item (c) Mr. João Pedro Azevedo (World Bank), for item (d) Mr. Richard Tonkin (United Kingdom), for item (e) Mr. Bernd Becker (Germany), for item (f) Ms. Sabine Alkire (Oxford University), for item (h) Mr. Christian Oldiges (University of Heidelberg) and for item (i) Ms. Ala Negruta (Moldova).

6. The discussion at the meeting was based on papers that are available on the UNECE website.[1]

[1] http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=37879#/

III. Recommendations for future work

7. Participants appreciated the exchange of experience and good practice among countries with different practices and challenges in poverty measurement, which took place at the Seminar. To continue this exchange, the meeting proposed organizing the next UNECE seminar on poverty measurement in 2016.

8. Participants agreed that the 2016 seminar should address the measurement of poverty based on income and consumption as well as the measurement of multidimensional poverty, with emphasis on international comparisons and multilateral cooperation. In addition, the following topics were suggested for discussion:

(a) Comparable indexes of multidimensional poverty: indicators and data requirements

(b) Measurement of inequalities

(c) Measurement of vulnerability to poverty

(d) Sub-national or small-area estimates of poverty

(e) Consideration of social transfers in poverty estimates

(f) Consideration of own production in poverty estimates

(g) Consideration of wealth in poverty estimates

9. It was proposed that the 2016 seminar addresses the issues and challenges related to the measurement of the Sustainable Development Goals indicators on poverty and the strengthening of the role of official statistics in this area.

10. The 2016 seminar would also review and discuss the draft guidelines prepared by the UNECE Task Force on Poverty Measurement.

11. Participants suggested UNECE to pursue activities that improve member countries' capacities in measuring and communicating statistics on poverty and inequalities, and publication of the related metadata. Among others, these activities could facilitate harmonization of household surveys across countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia.

12. Referring to the proposed Sustainable Development Goal 17 "Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development", participants highlighted the need to mobilise resources for strengthening statistical capacity and advancing the data revolution in the UNECE region, and to promote this cause at various international fora, such as the International Conference on Financing for Development and the High-level Group for Partnership, Coordination and Capacity-Building for Post-2015 Monitoring.

IV. Adoption of the report of the meeting

13. The present report was adopted during the closing session.

14. A summary of the discussion in the substantive sessions of the meeting will be presented in the annex of this report, to be prepared by the Secretariat after the meeting.

Annex I

Summary of the main issues discussed at the substantive sessions

1. Mr. Andres Vikat, Chief of the Social and Demographic Statistics Section of the UNECE Statistical Division opened the Seminar and explained its role in the context of activities of the Conference of European Statisticians.

2. The first presentation was given by Mr. Taeke Gjaltema of UNECE, who presented the latest developments in the monitoring the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and their relevance for the poverty measurement. The presentation reflected the recent discussions on the post-2015 development agenda with an emphasis on the importance of measuring poverty, inequality and vulnerability under the SDGs.

3. The speaker outlined several important risks related to the process of the selection of indicators:

(a) The current debates may lead to the selection of indicators that are too many to have a meaningful evaluation of progress.

(b) The data may not be available for many of the chosen indicators and full coverage of the 169 targets may become impossible.

(c) The risk of the process becoming politically driven rather than a technical process may make it difficult to perform an objective monitoring.

4. The Seminar continued with a presentation from the Chair of the UNECE Task Force on Poverty Measurement who summarized the results of the UNECE Questionnaire on Methods in Poverty Measurement in Official Statistics. Forty-four countries replied, including 37 countries of UNECE region and 7 countries outside the UNECE region (Australia, China, Columbia, Japan, Mongolia, New Zealand, and Mexico). The results showed that the practices in measuring poverty differ substantially from country to country, both by type of poverty and by estimation methods. It was noted, for example, that although most of the countries use categories of income when they develop indicators of welfare/wealth, the applied categories are not fully comparable. Some countries use monetary income and others monetary income and income in kind.

5. Likewise, the measurement of subjective poverty in different countries is very diverse. Some use questions of the ability to meet various needs, that is, deprivation indicators. Others use questions of whether an individual considers him/herself as poor. Similar to subjective poverty, there are many different approaches to the measurement of non-income poverty and multidimensional poverty. Some countries apply indicators of satisfaction with non-material aspects of life in addition to those measuring satisfaction of material needs. Data sources and data collection methods also vary across countries. For international comparisons, a common view on operational definitions and methodological solutions needs to be worked out.

6. The next presentation was from Mr. Gady Saiovici (UNECE). He focused on the survey outcomes in the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia. It was noted that most of these countries use the absolute poverty approach. Half of them also reported using relative poverty and subjective poverty measurements. Estimates on multidimensional poverty were available in only three countries.

7. The Seminar covered four substantive topics: monetary poverty, multidimensional poverty, subjective poverty and population groups. A variety of speakers from national statistical offices and government agencies, representatives of World Bank, Eurostat, and other international organizations, leading researchers from Oxford University and other

academic institutions made presentations under the topics and provided more than 20 papers as a basis for the discussions. The summary of the discussions is below.

A. Monetary poverty

8. Under this topic, the Seminar focused on conventional measures of poverty that relate to household per capita income or expenditure estimates. It covered two substantive topics with one discussant each: (1) monetary poverty: country cases and (2) monetary poverty: comparability.

9. Part 1 of the session was focused on the national experiences in dealing with monetary poverty assessment and related methodological issues. It was based on papers and presentations from Azerbaijan, Latvia, the Russian Federation, Poland, Ukraine, and Norway. Jordan also submitted a paper, although the author could not attend the seminar to present it. Mr. João Pedro Azevedo of the World Bank led the discussion.

10. Part 2 of the session addressed comparability issues in estimating poverty. It was based on papers and presentations from UNDP, CIS-STAT, ECLAC, Eurostat and the World Bank. Mr. Richard Tonkin of the United Kingdom led the discussion.

1. Country cases

11. The Latvian participant presented the national experience with poverty and inequality measurement in the country during the crisis. The Central Statistical Bureau (CSB) of Latvia regularly publishes indicators of monetary poverty, material deprivations, social exclusion and income inequality in accordance with the Eurostat methodologies. Public attention to these indicators increased after 2008, during the economic recession. The CSB has found that these indicators showed trends that were often counterintuitive. Decrease in disposable income and employment levels during the crisis resulted in reducing the threshold of poverty risk by 22% in 2010 as compared to 2008, whereas nominal material needs did not go down. In conclusion, the speaker stressed the importance to communicate the statistics on poverty in a user-friendly manner despite the complicated methodologies.

12. The speaker from the Russian Federation presented the national experience with poverty and inequality statistics. Some new developments included an introduction of a relative poverty line and a rate based on the OECD standards, introduction of a two-level poverty measurement based on indicators of monetary and total household income, and the extension of indicators for describing poverty profiles. Efforts have been made to provide data comparability in the long-term.

13. The representative of Azerbaijan described in detail the data collection process using the Household Budget Survey. He provided a definition of the poverty line and presented the monetary measures of poverty in the country. He also provided information about a pilot project using Eurostat methodology in estimating material deprivation.

14. The participant from Poland illustrated that the choice of different methodological solutions influences poverty rates. For example, applying different equivalence scales does not have a significant impact on the assessments of poverty rates at the level of the whole population, however it does influence the results when broken down into different age groups. The speaker further discussed the differences in the methodologies of EU-SILC and the Household Budget Survey used in Poland, e.g. method of surveying, reference period, and definition of total disposable income. In conclusion, he pointed out that high quality metadata to the statistical data is necessary for the users to minimalize the risk of misinterpretation. It is also important to use the applied methodological solutions over time consistently in order to obtain valuable and comparable statistical data throughout the years.

15. The presentation from Ukraine described the impact of social and economic changes on poverty incidence and trends in Ukraine in 2000-2013 and gave an analysis of different forms of poverty: monetary and non-monetary, including subjective and deprivation poverty. It outlined the approaches to certain methodological challenges related to poverty measurement such as those aimed at improving the reliability of poverty indicators at a subnational level and minimizing possible bias in indicators due to insufficient coverage of high-income population groups. The speaker outlined future tasks related to the harmonization of studies on household incomes and material deprivations in the national statistical system of Ukraine with the European living conditions survey methodology.

16. The representative of Norway described the national experience of his country in using income registers to identify the poor, e.g. tax return register, the labour and welfare administration, the state housing bank, etc. The measurement of poverty largely benefited from cooperation of statisticians with their colleagues working on demographics. Although, registers proved to be an efficient source of poverty statistics in Norway, the speaker listed some of the drawbacks, including missing information on informal work or illegal activities, inter-household transfers, rental income, etc. The advantages of using registers, on the other hand, are that there is no risk of non-response and sampling errors and no need for population weighting. In general, the results of EU-SILC and Statistics Norway show a good overlap, however, as to more specific target groups, such as single parents, the data differs.

17. The discussant Mr. João Pedro Azevedo (World Bank) noted the existing data issues in both surveys and administrative records, including in times of transition from one survey to another, challenges with administrative records and non-response to household surveys. The speaker also pointed out the importance of having good metadata on the indicators to facilitate media and other users understand the information. Political selectivity of indicators (intentionally or not) was also noted as an issue.

18. Other issues raised in the discussion referred to the use of microdata and the latest improvements of microdata documentation under the World Bank's Data Documentation Initiative (DDI), and the use of equivalence scales and their adjustments factors.

19. The participants noted the diversity in measuring absolute poverty on a country and regional level and the need for regular update of absolute poverty lines in a comparable way across countries. It was mentioned that income and consumption data are collected systematically in the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia, which is a big advantage in this region.

20 Measuring absolute poverty in advanced countries based on absolute thresholds linked to food consumption causes problems, because it is only a small share in the observed pattern of consumption. Regarding relative poverty, a discussion took place on how the inequality measure between countries may become insufficient in the context of the EU and on the challenges of comparing inequality measures across countries.

21. The need to have a common approach and to follow the same principles in calculating absolute and relative poverty measures was emphasised. The participants asked for a coordinated effort of national statistical offices to work in one direction.

2. Comparability

22. The presentation of UNDP discussed poverty and inequality trends in selected countries of Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia, and linked these trends to the issues of vulnerability, exclusion, and sustainability. The speaker presented evidence that reductions in income poverty and inequalities go together, and were broadly consistent with the region's development trends. European countries were more likely to use relative poverty standards, measured vis-à-vis some average living standard (generally 50-70% of median income or consumption), either in addition to or instead of absolute poverty thresholds. Furthermore, the speaker stressed the importance of measuring social exclusion and

vulnerability to poverty and outlined the main drivers of risks to poverty based on location, gender and age. The risks of poverty are particularly high for residents of rural areas, those unable to work, individuals living alone, single-parent families, and families with many children. In addition, the UNDP representative noted that measures of the extent to which people are deprived of the goods, services, capabilities, and opportunities to live long, healthy, prosperous lives—are too complex to be effectively captured in a single composite indicator.

23. The representative of CIS-STAT made a short review of methodological and conceptual approaches to poverty measurement and provided poverty estimates for the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia. The speaker made examples of comparison among these countries to the extent possible with regard to absolute poverty. It was noted that even details like age group delineations for defining the young differ between countries and make it difficult to compare. The speaker concluded that it is important to have international guidelines to harmonise definitions and approaches.

24. The Statistics Division of ECLAC estimates annually the magnitude of poverty in Latin American countries as part of its regular follow-up of the social situation in the region. The speaker informed that the poverty lines in the Latin American countries are currently being updated. The basis for obtaining data is the income and expenditure survey, which is conducted every 10 years and not on a more regular basis. The presenter explained that the methods for measuring absolute poverty generally require using information on household food expenditure (as proxy for food consumption) and deriving its corresponding caloric intake and cost-per-calorie. Several issues related to the measurement of caloric intake through expenditure surveys were noted, as well as their effect on the construction of absolute poverty lines.

25. The representative of **Eurostat** presented the planned future developments of EU-SILC and new directions taken to modernize the social statistics in a policy context. The main objectives are to increase responsiveness to user needs, quality and efficiency. The programme included actions pushing towards integration of data collections, with standardisation of variables and modules, wider use of administrative data sources and improved statistical frames. The programme covered social microdata collections (collections based on samples), population statistics (including census) and administratively-based statistics and accounts.

26. The speaker stressed that the high priority given by the Council and the Commission to the fight against poverty and social exclusion in the European Union, even more in the context of the economic and financial crisis, requires comparable and, as much as possible, timely statistics to monitor this process. The demands concerning living conditions, income, inequalities, quality of life and integration with macroeconomics are also increasing. The need for timely data was also stressed, in particular in the crisis context where social impact of the policies is important. In addition to timely data, early estimates of relevant social indicators need to be developed, as is already the case in the area of national accounts and price statistics.

27. Key driver of EU-SILC revision is the multidimensional aspect of living conditions, social inclusion/ exclusion. There are several requests to accommodate in the current flexibility mechanism of the ad hoc modules. These issues include more information on children, access to services, vulnerability, consumption and wealth, structure of the households, quality of life and well-being, health, more breakdowns of social benefits and transfers, social transfers in kind , etc. Work on preparing early estimates methodology is starting and the improved measurement of material deprivation will be implemented on a systematic basis from 2016 onwards.

28. The representative of the **World Bank** discussed the concrete issues in constructing and updating of poverty lines. Poverty lines need to be updated regularly to better compare poverty of different households in the country, over time, between countries at global and

regional levels, to better monitor poverty, to better define a poverty reduction strategy and to better evaluate the impact of a poverty reduction strategy. The speaker described the theoretical advantages of consumption measures and the policy advantages of income measures, and the issues stemming from the required adjustments for household expenditures. In conclusion, he pointed out that clarity, transparency and simplicity are the most critical aspects of any poverty measure.

29. The discussion, led by Mr. Richard Tonkin (United Kingdom) stressed the definition of poverty and the purpose of measuring poverty. Consumption and income poverty measures are the most widely used. It was noted that countries face competing demands. Despite of this comparability needs to be improved. One way ahead is to try to replicate the poverty estimates provided by different countries. Access to microdata, however, is needed in order to make the replications.

B. Multidimensional poverty

30. Under this agenda item, the Seminar discussed multidimensional poverty. It covered two substantive topics with one discussant each: (1) multidimensional poverty: country cases and (2) multidimensional poverty index.

31. Part 1 of the session discussed the country cases on measuring multidimensional poverty. In addition, it considered the broader issue of measuring inequality. It was based on papers and presentations from OPHI, Austria, Turkey, and Heidelberg University. It also included comments on the papers from Colombia and Mexico, the authors of which were not present at the meeting. Mr. Bernd Becker of Germany led the discussion.

32. Part 2 of the session presented the national and international experiences with multidimensional poverty indexes. It was based on papers and presentations from Armenia and the World Bank jointly, ECLAC, and TU Dortmund University. Ms. Sabina Alkire of Oxford University led the discussion.

1. Country cases

33. During the session, the participants agreed that today the multidimensional character of poverty is broadly recognized. Poor health, job insecurity, social exclusion, malnutrition/obesity, lack of personal security, insufficient pension contributions are only some examples of other relevant aspects of multidimensional poverty. The participants debated on how to capture all these dimensions in a meaningful and comparable way.

34. The presentation by Austria covered the Austrian approach to measure multidimensional inclusion, and its challenges and comparability issues. The presentation also introduced SORESI, a micro-simulation social reform model in which users can test changes in taxation and benefits policy and their impacts on poverty and other social outcomes in a web-based platform, increasing transparency and providing the general audience the opportunity to test different policy options. It has been highlighted that the key components for their approach's success are: (i) solid data infrastructure, (ii) partnership for analysis (between the relevant Ministries and the Statistical Office), and (iii) participation and feedback (providing legitimacy and policy impact).

35. The representative of Turkey presented the poverty statistics produced by the Turkish Statistical Institute, the new proposed approaches and the current next steps. Turkey produces relative poverty statistics based on Eurostat's methodology and using EU-SILC data. In addition, they previously produced absolute poverty measures using the Household Budget Survey, however due to some difficulties in comparability over time and across regions, this approach has stopped in 2009. Currently, Turkey is investing in a new poverty measure approach using a multidimensional methodology including four dimensions (education, health, dwelling and labour force outcomes). Methodological

studies are ongoing to further examine the policymakers' needs and test different alternative scenarios. Turkey plans to publish this MPI in 2016.

36. The speaker from Heidelberg University showed his work on creating a monthly multidimensional food index in India, which provides a framework on poverty beyond the traditional poverty headcount measures and calculates deprivation in multiple food items. It also captures the links between landholding and multiple deprivations. Moreover, the monthly multidimensional food index can be used to track seasonality, acting as a useful tool for policy interventions.

37. The presentation by the researcher from Oxford University illustrated the possibilities of analyses that could be made by implementing an Alkire-Foster methodology using limited variables across EU-SILC cross-sectional data in from 2006 to 2012. The presentation included the methodology for identifying the deprivations, the possibilities of aggregation and decompositions (gender, age), and suggestions for some improvements to EU-SILC data, particularly on self-reported variables.

38. The discussion led by Mr. Bernd Becker (Germany) revolved around the appropriateness of having a single global MPI, particularly given the possibilities of different variable selections for different regions and the subsequent comparability issues. It has been acknowledged that regional choices of variables might be appropriate to capture specific contexts and to avoid very crude comparisons between countries at different levels of economic development.

39. On the empirical work possibilities, it has been noted that there is an increasing use of panel data in order to track individuals and households over time and that the existence of longitudinal data might even make possible a richer choice of variables in a multidimensional index.

40. Another topic was the increased effort concerning good communication of multidimensional statistics for the general audience and decision makers, particularly in light of the upcoming SDGs. The role of UNECE in promoting multidimensional poverty measures in the international arena was welcomed by participants.

2. Multidimensional poverty index

41. The first presentation under the topic of MPI, by Armenia and the World Bank demonstrated the methodological efforts to develop a multidimensional poverty indicator framework in Armenia. The multidimensional poverty data in Armenia aim to complement the current consumption-based poverty indicators, monitor progress on development goals, and better inform policymakers.

42. The presentation by ECLAC showed the links between multidimensional poverty measures in Latin America and the traditional poverty measures. It explicitly focused on how to compile existing datasets in order to provide roughly comparable numbers for the region. The presentation showed that the current available information is insufficient and lacks comparability. Also highlighted was the opportunity the current SDGs and data revolution processes offer to improve household surveys, through the harmonization of certain basic dimensions and increase in scope. The SDG process also acts as a stimulus for better coordination between the national statistical systems.

43. The presentation by the participant from the TU Dortmund University showed an initiative to produce multidimensional poverty measures in Germany to broaden the coverage of the current Reports of Poverty and Wealth in the country with a summary measure based on material deprivation. The results are consistent with earlier findings, which indicate the higher prevalence of poverty among people with migration background, elderly or with lower fathers' educational level. The structure of poverty in the country is relatively stable over time, with some groups (i.e. elderly and migrants) exhibiting specific profiles of poverty and deprivation.

44. The discussion led by Ms Sabina Alkire (OPHI) reflected some methodological aspects in calculating multidimensional papers. It was indicated that ideally multidimensional poverty indicators should include variables that can be impacted by policy changes rather than stock indicators. Also discussed were some data constraint aspects and comparability issues. Another topic was the possible links between the Alkire-Foster methodology and the capability approach. The inclusion of social exclusion indicators (i.e. political or social participation) in MPI measures was also welcomed by participants, and the issue of including subjective measures in these indicators should be a matter of further thought. The need of international cooperation in order to allow National Statistical Offices to be in a better position to inform policymakers in their respective countries of the value of multidimensional indicators was also debated.

C. Subjective poverty

45. The session examined the concept of poverty as an individual feeling and not as an objective status. It was based on papers and presentations from Poland and Ukraine. Colombia also submitted a paper, which was taken into consideration during the discussion. Mr. Christian Oldiges of the University of Heidelberg led the discussion.

46. During the session, the participants recognised the importance of person's own subjective perceptions of his or her well-being for poverty measurement, and provided examples of national determinants of subjective poverty and the approaches to its measurement.

47. The representative of Poland illustrated the link between poverty and subjective well-being. In Poland, subjective poverty is measured based on life satisfaction, emotional well-being, and sense of meaning in life. Low levels of income are not directly correlated with other forms of poverty. Similarly, income higher than the poverty threshold does not necessarily indicate good living conditions. The presenter, therefore, concluded that from the point of view of the policy needs, it is necessary to broaden the analyses of poverty to the non-income aspects.

48. The speaker from Ukraine described the approaches to poverty assessment on the national and sub-regional levels. It showed that the rural versus urban location is one the main factors that determines the risk of poverty. The speaker also presented results of the new social programmes on poverty reduction in certain groups of the population implemented in the country in the last years. One of the successful examples was the state programme on child allowances, which have been increasing eery2-3 years. Finally, the presenter highlighted new developments in measuring poverty, which included the inability to pay for medical services, bad living conditions, insolvency, and the loss of property due to war operations.

49. The discussion led by Mr Christian Oldiges (University of Heidelberg) summarized the points made by the presenters and in particular highlighted the fact that families who feel poor by objective criteria may not feel poor by subjective criteria and vice versa. In Poland, living conditions were found to influence subjective poverty rather than income poverty. In Ukraine, subjective poverty was the highest across all groups and regions. In the United Kingdom, based on Household Budget Surveys it was found that there is a strong correlation between the feeling of anxiety and income. An interesting point of discussion was how people perceive social payments. It was noted that it might be difficult to single out the effect of specific social schemes, e.g. child benefits, as same households may fall into different categories and may receive several benefits.

D. Population groups

50. The session looked into the issue of minority or vulnerable groups that are at risk to poverty. It was based on papers and presentations from EU-FRA and Kyrgyzstan. Ms. Ala Negruta of the Republic of Moldova led the discussion.

51. The representative of the EU-FRA made important conclusions regarding the data on Roma populations. The various sources have different strengths and weaknesses and should be used in a complementary manner. Additional ethnic identifiers are possible to include, e.g. (1) for censuses to provide reliable and robust data for monitoring long-term changes and (2) for standardized European surveys to yield data with higher frequency. Custom sample surveys can fill the gap in cases when applying ethnic identifiers is not possible and can provide comparability across countries. The presentation stressed the fact that the different approaches to poverty (absolute, relative or multidimensional) classifies as poor different people according to the different measures. It was noted that only 17% of the surveyed population was classified as poor according to the three measures. Overlap is observed in very small portions in Slovakia, Czech Republic, and Bulgaria. Systematically the multidimensional poverty gives the lowest number of poor; however, the concept reflects better the specific challenges of Roma inclusion, an area that might be addressed through thematic modules in the standardized European surveys.

52. The presentation by Kyrgyzstan showed their experience in measuring child poverty. In Kyrgyzstan, child poverty affects 45% of all children. The rate of child poverty is higher than average poverty in the country. The presenter described the methodology of the construction and calculation of their Child Poverty Index, based on different aspects of child well-being. The level of child poverty is determined by a combination of factors such as child morbidity and mortality, level of education and upbringing, access to health services, crime situation and other aspects directly or indirectly influencing the quality of children and adolescents lives.

53. The discussion led by Ms. Ala Negruta (Republic of Moldova) highlighted the fact that the traditional surveys or indicators usually do not capture certain population groups that are potentially more affected than others based on age, ethnicity, geographical location, legal status, or other characteristics. The discussant stressed the differences between EU and national definitions. Examples were given regarding coverage in rural and urban areas, the selection of dimensions and indicators for these groups.

54. During the discussion, it was clarified that disaggregating the population by gender, age and disabilities may require changes in survey samples. In some countries, oversampling was required, depending on the propensity of the population group members to identify themselves as belonging to the group. For example, questions like do you have double identity, and what is the language spoken in your family may help to identify the group members.